

09/329,140

MS115203.01/MSFTP334US

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 25, 31, 41 and 50 have been amended herein to further emphasize novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention. A version of all pending claims can be found at pages 2-14. Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 25-31, 39-42, and 50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 25-31, 39-42, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goh (US 5,678,015), in view of Yablonski *et al.* (US 6,577,304). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Goh and Yablonski *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every aspect set forth is the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a user interface that visually links related information rendered in multiple windows, wherein the consequences of changes to one type of information in one window is depicted/reflected in the other types of information on the other windows. In particular, independent claim 1 recites: *accepting a decisional event from the user input device, the decisional event utilized as a basis to query one or more external or internal data sources to gather first and second information related to the decisional event*. Claims 25, 31, 41 and 50 recite similar claim aspects. Neither Goh

09/329,140

MS115203.01/MSFTP334US

nor Yablonski *et al.*, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest these novel aspects of the invention as claimed.

The primary document, Goh, relates to graphical user interfaces that permit a user to utilize a workspace of greater effective area than that permitted by the size of the display screen. The cited document, however, is silent regarding the utilization of a decisional event as the basis of a query to elicit from external and internal data sources first and second information related to the decisional event entered by a user. Thus, it is submitted that the primary document does not disclose, teach or suggest these salient features of the claimed invention.

Moreover, the Examiner acknowledges that Goh fails to teach or suggest that the interface is utilized to assist in the decision-making process, and offers Yablonski *et al.* to rectify this particular shortcoming. Yablonski *et al.* provides a system and method for visually representing a supply chain to reduce or eliminate problems associated with the supply chain. However, like Goh, the secondary document fails to disclose, teach or suggest utilizing a decisional event input by a user as the basis to generate a query that accesses internal and external data sources (*e.g.*, the Internet) to gather and present information related to the decisional event. Consequently, it is believed that Yablonski *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiency with respect to Goh, and that this rejection should be withdrawn with regard to independent claims 1, 25, 41 and 50 (and claims that depend there from).

II. Rejection of Claims 1-5, and 50 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 1-5, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Horvitz *et al.* (US 5,880,733). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Horvitz *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaa Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed.

09/329,140

MS115203.01/MSFTP334US

Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

As stated *supra*, independent claims 1 and 50 recite similar limitations, namely: *the decisional event utilized as a basis to query one or more external and internal data sources to gather first and second information related to the decisional event, and querying at least one internal data source and the Internet to access at least first information of a first type and second information of a second type related to the exepectational event.* Horvitz *et al.* does not disclose or suggest such novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

Horvitz *et al.* relates to a display system that manages and manipulates the displayed windows of an operating system to provide a virtual three-dimensional workspace for a computer system. Horvitz *et al.* however does not disclose employing decisional/expectational events to query external and internal data sources to access information related to the decisional/expectational events. Nowhere in Horvitz *et al.* is such an exemplary feature disclosed or suggested. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with regard to independent claims 1 and 50, and associated dependent claims, is requested.

09/329,140

MS115203.01/MSFTP334US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731